

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 285, noes 139, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

AYES—285

Ackerman	Frelinghuysen	Meyers
Allard	Frisa	Mica
Andrews	Frost	Miller (FL)
Archer	Funderburk	Molinari
Arney	Gallegly	Mollohan
Bachus	Gekas	Montgomery
Baker (CA)	Gephardt	Moorhead
Baker (LA)	Geren	Murtha
Ballenger	Gillmor	Myers
Barr	Gilman	Myrick
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Nethercutt
Barton	Goodling	Neumann
Bass	Goss	Ney
Bentsen	Graham	Norwood
Bevill	Green	Nussle
Bilbray	Greenwood	Ortiz
Bilirakis	Gunderson	Oxley
Bliley	Gutierrez	Packard
Blute	Gutknecht	Pallone
Boehlert	Hall (TX)	Parker
Boehner	Hancock	Pastor
Bonilla	Hansen	Paxon
Bono	Hastert	Payne (VA)
Brewster	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Browder	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Brown (FL)	Hayes	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Hayworth	Pombo
Brownback	Hefley	Pomeroy
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Porter
Bunn	Herger	Portman
Bunning	Hilleary	Pryce
Burr	Hobson	Quillen
Burton	Hoekstra	Quinn
Buyer	Hoke	Radanovich
Callahan	Horn	Rahall
Calvert	Hostettler	Ramstad
Camp	Houghton	Richardson
Canady	Hoyer	Riggs
Cardin	Hunter	Roberts
Castle	Hutchinson	Rogers
Chabot	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Chambliss	Inglis	Ros-Lehtinen
Christensen	Istook	Roth
Chrysler	Jackson-Lee	Roukema
Clinger	Johnson (SD)	Royce
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Coburn	Jones	Sanford
Coleman	Kasich	Saxton
Collins (GA)	Kelly	Scarborough
Combest	Kennedy (MA)	Schaefer
Condit	Kennedy (RI)	Schiff
Cooley	Kildee	Scott
Cox	Kim	Seastrand
Cramer	King	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Kingston	Shadegg
Crapo	Klug	Shaw
Cremeans	Knollenberg	Shays
Cubin	Kolbe	Sisisky
Cunningham	LaHood	Skeen
Davis	Lantos	Skelton
Deal	Largent	Smith (MI)
DeLay	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Deutsch	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Laughlin	Smith (WA)
Dickey	Lazio	Solomon
Dicks	Leach	Souder
Dixon	Levin	Spence
Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Dornan	Lewis (KY)	Stenholm
Doyle	Lightfoot	Stockman
Dreier	Lincoln	Stump
Dunn	Linder	Talent
Durbin	Livingston	Tate
Ehlers	LoBiondo	Tauzin
Ehrlich	Longley	Taylor (MS)
Emerson	Lucas	Taylor (NC)
Engel	Manton	Tejeda
English	Manzullo	Thomas
Ensign	Martini	Thornberry
Everett	Mascara	Thornton
Ewing	McCollum	Tiahrt
Fawell	McCrery	Torkildsen
Fazio	McDade	Torricelli
Fields (TX)	McHugh	Trafficant
Flanagan	McInnis	Vucanovich
Foley	McIntosh	Waldholtz
Forbes	McKeon	Walker
Fowler	Meehan	Walsh
Fox	Meek	Wamp
Franks (CT)	Menendez	Watts (OK)
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf	Weldon (FL)

Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield

Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—139

Abercrombie
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Doggett
Dooley
Duncan
Edwards
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson

Bateman
Chenoweth
Collins (MI)
Dingell

Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Klecza
Klink
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens

NOT VOTING—10

Hall (OH)
LaFalce
Matsui
Moakley
Peterson (FL)
Reynolds

□ 2217

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote 582 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here, I would have cast an "aye" vote.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. Mr. Chairman, so that Members will not be confused, I do not intend to ask for a recorded vote now on the Skaggs amendment as amended. We would proceed with the Serrano amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, since there is not a rollcall vote on the Skaggs amendment, is the next vote the Serrano amendment, which would be number 5 in the normal order?

The CHAIRMAN. To be perfectly clear, the next vote is on the Skaggs

amendment, as amended. It is our hope it will be approved by voice. Once that is approved by voice, the next vote under the pending business will be the Serrano vote.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS, AS AMENDED

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. SERRANO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 277, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—150

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Pastor
Baesler	Gordon	Payne (NJ)
Baldacci	Harman	Payne (VA)
Barcia	Hayes	Pelosi
Barrett (WI)	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Becerra	Hilliard	Pickett
Beilenson	Hinchey	Poshard
Bentsen	Hoekstra	Rangel
Bishop	Holden	Reed
Bonior	Hoyer	Rivers
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Roemer
Boucher	Jacobs	Rose
Browder	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Brown (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Rush
Bryant (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Sabo
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Sanders
Clayton	Johnston	Sawyer
Clement	Kanjorski	Schroeder
Clyburn	Kaptur	Scott
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Serrano
Conyers	Kolbe	Skaggs
Cooley	LaFalce	Slaughter
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Smith (MI)
Coyne	Lincoln	Stark
Cramer	Lipinski	Stenholm
Danner	Lofgren	Stokes
de la Garza	Lowey	Studds
DeFazio	Luther	Stupak
DeLauro	Maloney	Tanner
Dellums	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Dixon	Martinez	Thompson
Doggett	Matsui	Thornton
Dooley	McDermott	Thurman
Durbin	McHale	Torres
Edwards	McKinney	Towns
Eshoo	McNulty	Tucker
Evans	Mfume	Upton
Farr	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Fattah	Mineta	Vento
Fazio	Mink	Visclosky
Fields (LA)	Montgomery	Volkmer
Filner	Moran	Ward
Flake	Nadler	Waters
Foglietta	Neal	Watt (NC)
Ford	Oberstar	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Obey	Williams
Furse	Olver	Woolsey
Ganske	Orton	Wyden
Gejdenson	Owens	Wynn
Gilchrest	Parker	Yates

NOES—277

□ 2226

Ackerman	Gallegly	Murtha
Allard	Gekas	Myers
Andrews	Gephardt	Myrick
Archer	Geren	Nethercutt
Armey	Gibbons	Neumann
Bachus	Gillmor	Ney
Baker (CA)	Gilman	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Goodlatte	Nussle
Ballenger	Goodling	Ortiz
Barr	Goss	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Packard
Bartlett	Green	Pallone
Barton	Greenwood	Paxon
Bass	Gunderson	Peterson (MN)
Bereuter	Gutierrez	Petri
Berman	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bevill	Hall (TX)	Pomeroy
Billbray	Hamilton	Porter
Billirakis	Hancock	Portman
Bliley	Hansen	Pryce
Blute	Hastert	Quillen
Boehlert	Hastings (FL)	Quinn
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hayworth	Rahall
Bono	Hefley	Ramstad
Brewster	Heineman	Regula
Brown (FL)	Herger	Richardson
Brown (OH)	Hilleary	Riggs
Brownback	Hobson	Roberts
Bryant (TN)	Hoke	Rogers
Bunn	Horn	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Houghton	Roth
Burton	Hunter	Roukema
Buyer	Hutchinson	Royce
Callahan	Hyde	Salmon
Calvert	Inglis	Sanford
Camp	Istook	Saxton
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Cardin	Jones	Schaefer
Castle	Kasich	Schiff
Chabot	Kelly	Schumer
Chambliss	Kennedy (MA)	Seastrand
Chapman	Kennedy (RI)	Sensenbrenner
Christensen	Kildee	Kim
Chrysler	Kim	Shadegg
Clinger	King	Shaw
Coble	Kingston	Shays
Coburn	Klecza	Shuster
Coleman	Klink	Sisisky
Collins (GA)	Klug	Skeen
Combest	Knollenberg	Skelton
Condit	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Cox	Lantos	Smith (TX)
Crane	Largent	Smith (WA)
Crapo	Latham	Solomon
Creameans	LaTourette	Souder
Cubin	Laughlin	Spence
Cunningham	Lazio	Spratt
Davis	Leach	Stearns
Deal	Levin	Stockman
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Deutsch	Lewis (KY)	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Tate
Dickey	Linder	Tauzin
Dicks	Livingston	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Tejeda
Dornan	Longley	Thomas
Doyle	Lucas	Thornberry
Dreier	Manton	Tiahrt
Duncan	Manzullo	Torkildsen
Dunn	Martini	Torricelli
Ehlers	Mascara	Traficant
Ehrlich	McCarthy	Vucanovich
Emerson	McCollum	Waldholtz
Engel	McCrery	Walker
English	McDade	Walsh
Ensign	McHugh	Wamp
Everett	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Ewing	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Fields (TX)	Meehan	Weller
Flanagan	Meek	White
Foley	Menendez	Whitfield
Forbes	Metcalf	Wicker
Fowler	Meyers	Wilson
Fox	Mica	Wise
Franks (CT)	Miller (FL)	Wolf
Franks (NJ)	Minge	Young (AK)
Frelinghuysen	Molinari	Young (FL)
Frisa	Mollohan	Zeliff
Frost	Moorhead	Zimmer
Funderburk	Morella	

NOT VOTING—7

Bateman	Dingell	Reynolds
Chenoweth	Hall (OH)	
Collins (MI)	Moakley	

Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. SPRATT changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in defense of an organization that rises in defense of the poor and underprivileged of our country every day. The Legal Services Corporation was created under a Republican President and had at the outset very laudable goals: helping to give a sense of inclusion in the legal process and respect for the rule of law to the least wealthy of our society.

Perhaps there have been abuses of this program in the past. As with any government program, those activities considered by some to be abusive can be and have been addressed. But eliminating this important program would be a quintessential case of using a meat cleaver where a scalpel is desperately needed and much more appropriate.

At the core of this program is still the belief that even the least influential members of a society should have a voice in the legal proceedings that determine the way in which that society is ordered. The members of the Appropriations Committee have tried to return us to this commitment, and that commitment is what we as a body must continue to guarantee our least fortunate.

LSC, just like every program, must be re-evaluated and prepared to share in the effort to balance the budget. But it has been reexamined and it will share in the effort to balance the budget: further cuts could render this program very inadequate.

I urge my colleagues to refrain from swinging the budget ax down on the LSC. Legal services for the poor is something no democracy can go without.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my serious concern regarding the decision to eliminate funding for the East-West Center in H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

For those of my colleagues not familiar with the East-West Center it is a national education institution administered by a public, nonprofit educational corporation under a grant from the United States Information Agency. Established by the Mutual Security Act of 1960 (Public Law 86-472) the East-West Center promotes better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative programs of research, study, and training.

The friendly relationships that exist today between the United States and the countries of Asia and the Pacific can be attributed in many ways to the East-West Center's work. More than 20 countries in the Pacific region, including Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Fiji, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and even Bangladesh and Pakistan acknowledge the value of the East-West Center's programs by their cash contributions. The East-West Center was one of the early institutions involved in the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC] process.

Congress and governmental agencies, such as the Department of State, Department of Energy, and the Agency for International Development [AID], utilize the Center for advice and information. In fact, the Clinton administration acknowledged the value of the East-

West Center by including it in their fiscal year 1996 budget request.

Given the continued rise of Asia as the fastest growing economic region in the world, and the critical role of Asia in our economic future, it is more important than ever that we continue to support the East-West Center.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in the support of the substitute amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS and Mr. MOLLOHAN to H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

This amendment will restore funding for several important programs under the jurisdiction of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA], including the Coastal Zone Management Act and the National Marine Fisheries Service thereby allowing marine research and preservation efforts on our Nation's coastlines to continue. The hazards plaguing our coastal waters have multiplied at an alarming rate as the coastal population has grown. Since 1950, the coastal population has grown over 80 percent.

In addition to their environmental significance, America's coastal resources support many key industries. For example, coastal resources sustain a national travel and tourism economy that generates billions of dollars annually.

Our coasts also provide habitat and spawning areas for 70 percent of the Nation's commercial and recreational fisheries. America's marine sanctuaries and coastal resources also provide much-needed sites for recreation, education, inspiration, and personal exploration.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise to offer my support for the amendment offered by Mr. FARR. This important amendment provides funding for the marine sanctuaries around our coastline.

The Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary, located off the coast of San Francisco, is an excellent example of the successes achieved by the Sanctuary program. Since its designation in 1981, the Farallones Sanctuary has participated in various community partnerships ranging from the creation of a volunteer shoreline monitoring program to the development of a marine learning center in San Francisco.

The Sanctuary combines a spectrum of marine habitats with a tremendous diversity of marine life. Giant kelp, dungeness crab, the endangered Blue Whale, elephant seals, and the largest concentration of breeding seabirds in the continental United States are just several of the marine species found in the Sanctuary. The Farallones Sanctuary also contains highly productive commercial fisheries, shipping lanes, and private mariculture operations.

Mr. Chairman, without these amendments, the successful partnerships that NOAA has forged between communities, industries, and universities to protect the Nation's pristine marine environments through research, education and management would be difficult, if not impossible, to continue.

We are a coastal nation, predominantly surrounded by water. The health of our Nation depends on how we protect these waters and their living treasures.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly oppose any cuts in funding for the Legal Services Corporation, a move that would effectively shut millions of Americans out of the justice system.

For almost 30 years, federally funded Legal Services programs have promoted confidence

by low-income Americans in our system of laws. These Americans, like all of us, need to believe there is a real system in place to resolve disputes ranging from consumer fraud and housing issues, to domestic relations problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about the effect such cuts would have on many of the people who live in my district in Detroit, who rely on the pro bono assistance provided by the Legal Services Corporation. Without some kind of legal aid, the Nation's poorest citizens, including many of my own constituents, would have no recourse against unscrupulous merchants, no help in arranging adoptions or enforcing child support orders—in short, no access to the American legal system.

Families facing unjust evictions, disabled Americans who have to fight bureaucracy, women whose lives are threatened daily by domestic violence—these are the victims if the Legal Services Corporation loses funding. Helping such people is the essence of democracy.

My Republican colleagues who want to do away with a Federal tradition of funding legal services for our Nation's poorest citizens would be wise to remember the words of one of their own former Presidents, who in successfully promoting the 1974 bill to fund Legal Services, said the program should "become a permanent and vital part of the American system of justice."

I urge my colleagues to think twice before they do away with one of the few remaining resources that protects the rights of the poor.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2076, the fiscal year 1996 Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill.

One of the most disturbing provisions of H.R. 2076 is the huge cuts for the Legal Services Corporation [LSC] and the restrictions placed on LSC grantees. Since LSC was created in 1975 with President Nixon's support, the LSC has successfully provided assistance to millions of Americans who would otherwise be unable to afford legal representation. If only Americans who can pay for a lawyer have the chance to be legally represented, then the term justice has no meaning to a large portion of America. Clearly, in a nation like ours, it is vital that the justice system is open to all Americans, not just those who can afford it.

Already, LSC turns away 43 percent of eligible clients because its resources are so limited. The cuts in H.R. 2076 will reduce their ability to serve poor Americans even further. I am also concerned about H.R. 2076's impact on the National Clearinghouse for Legal Services. The clearinghouse, which is in my congressional district, provides much-needed resources and training to legal service agencies across the country and to lawyers working pro bono to provide legal assistance to poor Americans. In addition, the clearinghouse publishes the Clearinghouse Review of Poverty Law which provides updated analyses of legal developments in poverty law.

Also, I want to voice my concern about H.R. 2076's lack of funding for the Violence Against Women Act and the Community Oriented Policing Services Program [COPS]. The Violence Against Women Act and COPS program are intended to fill gaps in our anticrime efforts. Without funding, however, these important efforts will be completely undermined. Just last

year, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act with unanimous, bipartisan support. This year, we are effectively abolishing the act by not providing sufficient funding for it. That is clearly giving with one hand and taking it back with the other. I doubt most Americans support this type of backdoor renegeing on such important anticrime laws.

Mr. Chairman, I intended to oppose H.R. 2076 and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am most concerned about, and opposed to, the cuts to Indian legal service programs in H.R. 2076, the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill. In the bill, the Appropriations Committee has not only reduced funding of the Legal Services Corporation from \$400 million to \$278 million—a 30 percent reduction—but the committee also eliminated the separate line item for native American program funding, which last year provided \$10 million in funding. These actions will undoubtedly end in the termination of many Indian legal services programs.

Why is this Congress again abandoning those who need our help the most? Across countless Indian reservations, Indian legal services are the only source of legal aid to the poor and lawyerless. When 51 percent of American Indians living on reservations live below the poverty line, when Indian children have the highest dropout rate of any minority group, when 20 percent of Indian homes lack toilets, and when reservation unemployment levels average 50 percent and run up to 80 percent, who else but Indian legal services attorneys can they turn to for legal assistance?

I hope that those who still feel that Congress should cut the funding for Indian legal services will at least read the well-written and researched editorial, which I have attached, that describes the destructive effects that these cuts will have on Indian country.

Presently there are 33 Indian legal services programs in existence. The \$10 million in fiscal year 1995 funding made possible the work of approximately 150 attorneys, paralegals, and tribal court advocates serving clients on over 175 Indian reservations as well 220 Alaska Native villages. The work of these attorneys has helped tribes develop tribal courts and create programs for the prevention of domestic abuse and violence. In addition, legal services attorneys provide family counseling, child support enforcement, and help ensure the delivery of health care services to the poor, elderly, and disabled. In large Western Indian reservations, Indian legal services attorneys are often the only attorneys available in areas as large as the State of Connecticut. In Oklahoma, a staff of only 4 legal services attorneys is responsible for serving over 150,000 eligible people from 38 tribes. Cutting the funding for native American legal services will have a devastating effect on these and other Indian programs.

There is one more problem with this bill. The bill requires that Indian legal services programs compete for the remaining funding under a census-based formula—a scheme that will result in even further cuts to these programs which already are set to undergo drastic reductions. The current legal services line item funds Indian legal services programs at a level that is three to four times greater than the actual number of reservation-based individuals listed in the 1990 census. Past

studies have justified the need for increased funding for Indian legal services by as much as seven times the numbers that a straight census-based formula would yield. Increased funding on a non-census basis helps overcome such factors as geographic remoteness, access to legal resources, and language and cultural barriers.

Census-based funding also ignores the unique relationship between the Federal government and the Federal Government's prior recognition that census-based funding is unworkable. Since the inception of the Legal Services Corporation in 1974, it has been conceded by both Democrats and Republicans that effective legal services for Indians cannot be provided strictly on census-based numbers because: One, many tribes are not large enough to justify the funding of even one lawyer; and two, actual operating costs for Indian legal services attorneys are much higher than for other legal services programs because of remoteness and the unavailability and high costs of goods and services on reservations.

It is unconscionable, and a violation of this country's trust responsibility to native American tribes, that this Congress would eliminate the Indian people's most reliable access to the American system of justice. For the past 30 years, Indian legal services have become an integral part of this Nation's promise of equal access to justice. This bill will literally result in the denial of justice to the native American people.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1995]

LAWYERS DOING GOOD

(By Colman McCarthy)

In the current assaults on lawyers, among the underserving of scorn is the small, nearly invisible band of attorneys whose clients are Native Americans. They toil for Indian Legal Services in such outposts as Window Rock, Ariz., and Penobscot, Maine, and serve poor people in tribes ranging from the well-known—Navajos; Sioux and Cheyenne—to the less known: Menominees of Wisconsin, Houmas of Louisiana and Shinnecocks of Long Island.

Some cutters in Congress—budget cutters, deal-cutters, corner-cutters—have announced that federal funding should stop for the Legal Services Corp., of which Indian Legal Services is a part.

From its origins in 1966 with the Office of Economic Opportunity, and its rebirth in 1974 as a federally supported independent corporation, Legal Services has had a client list of the indigent and habitually lawyerless. This year's budget is \$415 million, which covers the work of 4,600 lawyers—starting salaries are as low as \$22,000—in 320 programs.

The caseload involves civil law which, for the poor, is really underdog law. An estimated 70 percent of America's lawyers work for 10 percent of the population. For those who are billable, there is one lawyer per 300 people. For those who aren't, Legal Services supplies one lawyer for 6,000 to 7,000 people.

If the destructive plans of Rep. John Kasich, the Ohio Republican who chairs the House Budget Committee, and Sen. Phil Gramm, who fantasizes that he should be president, are fulfilled and Legal Services goes under, the severest losses will be felt by the 2 million tribal Americans who have only 150 lawyers and paralegals between them and despair. Eleven Indian Legal Services programs are operating with 22 smaller offices folded within state agencies. Their share of the corporation's \$415 million is \$10 million.

The practice of Indian Legal Services in Wisconsin is typical. The state has 11 tribes,

with three lawyers in an office located in Wausau. The senior attorney is James Botsford, who went into Indian law immediately after graduating from the University of North Dakota law School in 1984. What inspired him then is what drives him now: going to the office every day and knowing deep in his soul that if he weren't there serving his clients they wouldn't be served at all. How many Wall Street or K Street lawyers can say that?

"There aren't many attorneys in the north woods of Wisconsin," Botsford says. "And precious few of those who are here have an interest, or even willingness to take Indian law cases. With all the poverty, remoteness and unique Indian law issues, we are able to provide legal help in only a small percentage of the cases that come up."

Among other puzzlements, Botsford wonders why Republicans have it in for Legal Services: "Much of our work in Wisconsin is consistent with the values that Republicans say they stand for—keeping families together, helping people to get off welfare, protecting families when there is violence in the home."

Others also are at a loss to figure out why Republicans are picking on Legal Services. In the April 10 National Law Journal, Bruce Kauffman, a former justice of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court and now a senior partner in a Philadelphia law firm, identifies himself as "a conservative Republican" who has "spent the better part of my life fighting for Republican candidates and causes."

Kauffman confesses to having once swallowed whole the falsity that Legal Services lawyers were agitators pushing "their social service agenda. Over time, however, I came to realize that the [program] acts very much like a law firm for the poor, helping individual clients grapple with personal problems that threaten to overwhelm them. Without these services, they have no recourse."

In his article—titled "A Conservative Plea to Save LSC"—Kauffman pledges—"I simply cannot stand by and watch the gutting of federal legal aid efforts on behalf of the poor."

For Indian Legal Services lawyer, Judge Kauffman is a welcome ally. And a natural one, too. As the four attorneys serving 38 tribes out of the Oklahoma Indian Legal Services office, or the one lawyer in the Dakota Plains Legal Services or any other tribal lawyers could explain the program has always had bipartisan support—from Richard Nixon to Hillary Clinton.

All the more perplexing that Kasich, Gramm and other enemies of Legal Services are out to destroy what so many others have praised. Are they that out of touch?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to restore funding in the bill for the State Justice Institute. Since filing the amendment, I have realized that a number of Members are not familiar with the work of the State Justice Institute, thereby leading me to conclude that now is not an opportune time to debate SJI funding. I will not offer the amendment.

But I want to let my colleagues know that there is a clear Federal interest in supporting programs like SJI, which promotes a just, effective, and innovative system of State courts. State courts have been the beneficiaries of more than 800 projects improving the quality of the justice they deliver, and the Federal judiciary has worked closely with SJI to improve the working relationship between the State and Federal courts.

Federal assistance to State courts is as appropriate as Federal assistance to State law enforcement, prosecution, and corrections

agencies. By helping the State courts to deliver justice more efficiently and effectively, SJI promotes their greater use by litigants, thereby reducing the number of cases filed in Federal court. Continued funding for SJI would provide the Administration and Congress with the opportunity to improve the State courts' response to important issues, such as family violence, the rights of children, drug abuse, and crime.

As a Member of Congress who has been active on the issue of domestic violence, I can attest to SJI's many contributions in improving the State courts' response to family violence. For example, the State Justice Institute is the entity responsible for implementing my legislation, approved by Congress in 1992, to develop training programs for judges and other court personnel about domestic violence, especially its impact on children, and to review child custody decisions where evidence of spousal abuse has been presented.

The Judicial Training Act addresses problems that many battered women have when they step into the courtrooms in this country to fight for custody of their children or to fight for equal justice in criminal cases. The response of our judicial system to domestic violence has been one of ignorance, negligence, and indifference, often with tragic consequences. The State Justice Institute has moved expeditiously to implement this act, and it has provided important assistance in improving the State courts' response to family violence.

Federal policies can have serious consequences for the State courts and often impose substantial responsibilities on the State courts. The State Justice Institute has provided important Federal assistance to help the State judiciaries cope with federally-imposed burdens, such as the Child Support Enforcement Act of 1984, the Family Support Act of 1986, and the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980. These Federal programs should be accompanied by Federal assistance for State courts to meet these increased demands. The State Justice Institute has filled this important role.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my profound regret and disappointment that the Republican Majority has eliminated all funds for the East-West Center in the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Bill. This short-sighted decision, simply for the sake of reaching a zero deficit in 7 years, will have serious consequences on the United States' ability to function as an economic and military power in the Pacific.

The elimination of all Federal funds signifies the end of the East-West Center. The Center was established by the Congress 35 years ago to foster mutual understanding and cooperation among the governments and peoples of the Asian-Pacific region. In the past 35 years it has become one of the most highly respected institutions in the world for its expertise in Asian-Pacific issues and for its work in promoting international cooperation throughout the region. The friendly relationship the United States enjoys with many countries in the Asian-Pacific region can be attributed to the Center's work over the past 35 years.

Over 53,000 Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders from over 60 nations and territories have participated in the East-West Center's educational, research and conference programs. Research conducted by the Center has provided a wealth of information on issues ranging from peace and military conflict, nu-

clear proliferation, implications of rapid economic growth, future of energy supply, population control, and social and cultural changes in the region.

The Center has achieved its greatest success through its educational programs for undergraduate and graduate students. The Center has had annual enrollment in recent years between 200–300 students. These students have gone on to become ambassadors, scholars, statesmen and business leaders who now have tremendous influence in the policy decisions of their respective countries (including the United States). They all carry with them the knowledge and experience gained at the East-West Center which in turn has helped the United States foster relationships with Asian and Pacific countries and promote U.S. interests in this region.

Not many people know that the East-West Center was in fact the brain-child of the great visionary Lyndon B. Johnson. It was his foresight and recognition of the increasing significance of the Pacific Region and the United States role in that future of this region. The United States is as much a part of the Asian-Pacific region as any other country. With States and territories bordering and within the Pacific region, the U.S. has just as much to win or lose in the economic and political future of this region.

The significance of the East-West Center in the United States' future in this region cannot be underestimated. It is inconceivable to me that this Congress which 35 years ago understood the importance of Lyndon Johnson's vision for American participation in the Asian-Pacific region would now act to close down one of our greatest resources for information on and cooperation with the countries of the Asian-Pacific Region.

Mr. Chairman, Johnson's clarion call to prepare the United States for a time when the Asian-Pacific countries would be among the most profitable and powerful in the world is even more relevant today than it was 35 years ago. The challenges facing this region and their implications for the U.S. have only increased in recent years. The danger of nuclear proliferation, ethnic and religious conflict, rapid economic growth, human rights issues in this region continue to fill the pages of the newspapers on a daily basis. We cannot afford to lose the East-West Center during these critical times.

I strongly oppose the elimination of all federal funding for the East-West Center. It is a short-sighted effort to reduce federal costs which in the long-term will only result in greater costs to our nation, not only in financial terms, but also in terms of our economic and political future in the Asian-Pacific region.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, as the House considers the 1996 Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations Act, I would like to remind Members of the Appropriations Committee's decision to prohibit any groups that receive Federal funds from engaging in any political advocacy efforts. This important decision marks another step toward ensuring that tax dollars go where they're really needed and not toward political causes the taxpayer may not support.

When deciding upon funding for the Legal Services Corporation we should apply the same reasoning. Democrats may try and portray the Corporation as simply a non-partisan body which provides legal access to the poor.

This may have been the intention of its founders, but sadly, today, nothing could be further from the truth. Instead the Legal Services Corporation is more focused on advancing grand social causes than helping the poor with ordinary legal problems. It has become an unaccountable lobbying group, and as such it is not a worthy recipient of Federal funds, especially in our time of fiscal restraint.

There are numerous examples of Legal Services Corporation abuses of taxpayer's money. For instance, LSC money was used to produce a brochure explaining how welfare recipients who get a large cash windfall, such as lottery prize or insurance settlement, can keep the windfall and stay on welfare. In addition, the LSC works to limit the ability of housing authorities to evict drug dealers from public housing projects. LSC lawyers file suits to block these evictions, thereby putting the law-abiding tenants at risk. The LSC is not committed to the poor, it is only committed to promoting its own radical liberal agenda.

It is time that we send a strong message to lawyers all over the country who have manipulated the LSC to serve themselves and their political crusades. The party is over! You can no longer ride free at the expense of the American taxpayer. The Republican majority in this Congress has declared its intention to stamp out such fraudulent abuses of taxpayer's money. Reducing funding for the Legal Services Corporation is the next step toward this goal.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from West Virginia, which would eliminate \$30 million earmarked for reimbursements to States for the costs of incarcerating criminal aliens.

In the United States there are over 50,000 prisoners in State and Federal facilities who are not American citizens. The incarceration of criminal aliens costs taxpayers' between \$15,000 and \$30,000 per inmate annually.

Last year, American citizens spent between \$800 million and \$1½ billion feeding, clothing, and housing illegal aliens.

It is a grave injustice to hold New Jersey and other State residents accountable for the Federal Government's failure in its inability to control its national borders.

The House took steps to remedy this problem when it passed the Violent Criminals Incarceration Act earlier this year. A provision in the bill, authored by my good friend from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], authorizes \$650 million per year for reimbursements to States for incurring this burden.

The bill before us today sets aside \$500 million for such reimbursements to States, and this proposed amendment would reduce that amount by \$30 million.

Mr. Chairman, the message from the American people is clear. Illegal immigration has taken a toll on this country. Illegal aliens who commit crimes and end up exacting not only personal costs to the people they hurt but also economic costs to those same people in the form of their tax dollars footing the bill for incarceration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. The drastic cuts made by the Appropriations Committee threaten our efforts to combat violent crime, to protect our ocean and coastal environments and to remain competitive in the global marketplace.

In 1994, the Congress passed the most comprehensive measure to fight violent crime in our Nation's history. The crime bill represents a balance between punishment and prevention which directs resources to the state and local level where the majority of crime fighting occurs. It will put 100,000 new police on the streets in neighborhoods nationwide and ensure that they are engaged in community policing. Community policing is an innovative approach to law enforcement which is widely credited by police, citizens and community leaders with substantially reducing criminal activity and improving relations between our police and citizens. The law provides funding for prisons, closes the revolving door which allows violent, repeat offenders out on to the street time and time again, and directs substantial resources to combating illegal immigration.

Finally, and very importantly, the crime bill provides billions of dollars for a wide range of locally designed and implemented efforts to prevent crime before it occurs. Prevention programs target young people before they become involved in crime and given them alternatives, including educational, vocational and recreational opportunities. Prevention programs also make good fiscal sense because programs can serve an entire community for what it costs to send a single person to prison for a year.

Early in this Congress, my Republican colleagues brought forth a series of bills which destroy the balance in the crime bill. As my colleagues know, these bills have literally been sitting in the other body for months. Perhaps out of frustration the Appropriations Committee is now attempting to carry out these policy changes by reordering spending in accordance with several of these bills. This is a blatant example of legislating in an appropriations bill. This action shows that some of my Republican colleagues are willing to use appropriations bills to effect changes that they are unable to enact into law through the normal process. This policy is disturbing in and of itself, but is more alarming because neither the bill nor the report provides guidance on what to do if the House-passed bills are not enacted into law by the start of the fiscal year. If the bills cited in H.R. 2076 do not become law, will funds to combat violent crime be allocated under the crime bill or will funding be cut off completely? These questions must be answered before the House moves forward.

The bill eliminates the COPS program, drug courts, crime prevention block grants, and assistance for rural law enforcement.

The COPS program has already put more than 20,000 police on the streets across the country, including two dozen in eastern Connecticut. The Justice Department has developed an application process which is straightforward and user-friendly. The program is supported by nearly every major police organization, including the Fraternal Order of Police, National Association of Police Organizations, and the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, as well as the U.S. Conference of Mayors. It boggles my mind that the committee would eliminate drug courts when drug-related crimes are clogging our criminal justice system. In addition, the bill eliminates prevention block grants and makes prevention an afterthought in the new Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program. This change is com-

pletely counterproductive and will result in additional spending in the future.

Finally, the bill provides \$100 million less than requested to support programs under the Violence Against Women Act. Domestic violence and spouse abuse are serious crimes which we have failed to adequately address in this country. The crime bill focused on this issue by toughening penalties and providing financial support for counseling, education and other programs designed to increase arrest rates and prosecutions of violators. Instead of following through on our commitment to millions of women across the country, the committee dramatically underfunds these efforts. These cuts will have real world implications for countless women who will continue to be abused, injured and killed because the Republican-led Congress failed to provide the resources necessary to combat domestic violence on all fronts. It is disturbing to me that the committee was able to allocate \$300 million, \$200 million more than requested, to offset the costs of incarcerating aliens while it slashed support for efforts to combat domestic violence. While women in every State in the Nation would benefit by funding violence against women programs at the level requested, only a handful of States will benefit from the alien incarceration provision. I urge my colleagues to consider this inequity when deciding how to vote.

Much to the credit of Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN, H.R. 2076 does not abolish the Commerce Department. However, it makes deep cuts in agencies and programs which are vital to assessing our environment, protecting our coastal communities, and ensuring that our fisheries and other marine resources continue to support economic activity into the next century. In addition, the bill deals a blow to efforts to promote tourism by eliminating the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration [USTTA]. Moreover, by eliminating initiatives such as the Advanced Technology Program [ATP], this bill jeopardizes efforts by U.S. companies to develop high-technology products which are absolutely essential for maintaining our position in the global economy in the next century.

As a representative of a coastal district and State, I am especially opposed to cuts in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA]. The bill slashes funding for NOAA by nearly \$200 million below the current fiscal year and more than \$350 million below the administration's request. Cuts of this magnitude will deal a serious blow to scientific research designed to assess global climate change, fisheries and coastal habitats. It is ironic that while many of my Republican colleagues are dramatically reducing support for scientific research they are demanding that decisions affecting our environment be based on sound science.

The cuts in NOAA have many implications for one half of our Nation's population which lives along our coasts. The bill reduces grants to states under the Coastal Zone Management Act [CZMA] by \$9.5 million below this fiscal year. Currently, 29 of 35 coastal States have approved management plans and receive Federal support to assist in the implementation of those plans. It is important to note that States must match Federal support on a dollar-to-dollar basis. Five other States are in the process of developing plans. By slashing support by nearly \$10 million, the bill jeopardizes efforts

to finalize the remaining plans and undermines activities in the other States to successfully protect marine environments. In addition, the committee eliminates all funding—\$5 million—to support State efforts to reduce coastal nonpoint source pollution. This cut is especially egregious when one considers that nonpoint source pollution is responsible for at least 50 percent of our remaining water pollution problems. These cuts mean that 29 States from Maine to California and Pennsylvania to Florida will receive \$15 million less to address these important issues. My State of Connecticut will see support slashed by \$444,000—a 37 percent reduction. This cut will adversely impact our efforts to safeguard our most important natural resource—Long Island Sound. These cuts are merely one example of the real world implications of H.R. 2076.

In another blow to important scientific research, the bill eliminates the National Undersea Research Program [NURP]. As the only national program specializing in research in our oceans and Great Lakes, NURP supports scientists involved in a wide range of research efforts relating to fisheries, marine habitat, and environmental technology development. This research is central to the mission of NOAA. In addition, NURP researchers are among a very small group of scientists who specialize in the use of manned and unmanned submersibles and mixed gas diving. Underwater robots and manned submarines allow scientists to conduct important experiments and observations which are impossible using surface-based techniques. This research is highly technical and requires years of experience to master. The National Undersea Research Program provides invaluable assistance to NOAA in carrying out its core mission to ensure the health of our marine environment and the sustainability of its resources. Eliminating NURP further undermines the ability of NOAA to provide the scientific data necessary to ensure that every American can enjoy the benefits of our coastal resources.

Finally, the bill deals a devastating blow to the National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS] by cutting its budget by \$84.5 million below the administration's request. This cut is a direct assault on thousands of communities nationwide which rely on fishing for their economic survival. This cut is especially damaging for fishermen in New England. As my colleagues may know, commercial fishing in the northeast has been sharply reduced as stocks of cod, haddock and flounder have collapsed. Overfishing and habitat destruction are largely to blame for restrictions which have closed areas of Georges Bank and forced fishermen to idle their boats for days at a time. Unfortunately, many other parts of the country face similar disasters as an increasing number of stocks are being overfished or harvested to the maximum sustainable level.

In order for fishing to become viable again in my part of the country, the NMFS must have the resources to accurately assess the current status of stocks, to develop and implement rebuilding plans, and to monitor the effects of these plans to determine when stocks have recovered. The cuts contained in this bill will not allow NMFS to effectively carry out these duties. For example, the bill cuts data collection and analysis, conservation and management operations, and State and industry assistance programs well below the administration's request and the fiscal 1995 level. This

is just another example of the counterproductive cuts in this bill which will make it even more difficult to address pressing national problems. Moreover, these cuts could rob the economy of nearly \$3 billion which NMFS estimates will be generated when fish stocks are recovered. Rather than gutting fishery conservation and development efforts, we should be investing in these areas so that we can enjoy the economic benefits in the future and avoid the mistakes of the past.

I urge my colleagues to support an amendment to be offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN which will restore funding for CZMA grants, the NMFS and the National Marine Sanctuary program. This amendment will restore CZMA funding to the fiscal 1995 level and will provide badly needed funds to the NMFS to carry out vital fishery assessment, monitoring and rebuilding efforts. While these programs are vitally important to coastal communities, fishing, tourism, and other economic activities dependent on a healthy marine environment generate billions of dollars for the national economy. With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2076 provides funding for some of our most vital Federal programs. Among governmental functions, law enforcement is one of the most significant. Unfortunately, this bill dramatically alters the balance of the crime bill and undermines our efforts to combat violent crime. It breaks our commitment to the American people to put 100,000 new police on the streets. The changes in title I of the bill, especially the allocation of funds in accordance with certain bills which are not law, are among the most blatant examples of legislating in an appropriations bill this member has ever seen. Furthermore, by sharply reducing funding for the Commerce Department, this bill threatens our economy at home and our competitive position in the global marketplace. Finally, the cuts in NOAA programs will be devastating to coastal communities which rely on a healthy and productive marine environment for their economic survival. I urge my colleagues to reject this measure.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Ms. NORTON's amendment, which would strike the language in this bill that prohibits the use of funds for abortions in the Federal prison system, unless the life of the mother would be endangered or in the case of rape.

The antiabortion provision in this bill is just another attack on the most vulnerable, accessible women in our society—those who are dependent upon the Federal Government for their health care.

Abortion has been a legal procedure in this country for over 20 years. It is a legal health care option for American women. But, because the Federal Government controls her health care, this bill would deny a woman in a Federal prison the right to make up her own mind as to whether or not she chooses to terminate her pregnancy. She could only choose to have an abortion if she could afford to pay for it herself.

A woman in prison has the right to decide to carry her pregnancy to term or to terminate it. It should be her decision. And, whatever that decision is, she should not be denied her constitutional right to receive necessary medical care. I urge my colleagues to support Ms. NORTON's amendment.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary appropriation bill.

I have particular difficulties with language the Appropriations Committee chose to include in its report. This language directs the Small Business Administration to delay implementing its reorganization plan "until the Congress has completed action on legislative changes to the SBA's mission." In addition, the report states that any changes should take place within a consultative process involving the authorizing and appropriating committees.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this an unwise instruction for several reasons. First, while the House will likely consider an SBA reorganization plan this fall, the Senate has made more limited progress. Therefore, it is questionable whether reorganization legislation will be completed during this session of Congress. Moreover, it is even less predictable whether the president would sign the resulting bill. In my judgment, it is not sensible to delay the SBA's reasonable consolidation and the associated taxpayer savings for such an uncertain and possibly lengthy amount of time.

Second, I believe this language represents another example of the attitude that Washington knows best. The Republicans are clearly violating their often-repeated pledge to allow local groups to make decisions about what is best for them. The SBA formulated its plan through close communication with and input from branch and district offices, local and State governments, and other interested parties. However, the committee majority is prepared to override these local decisions and impose its own direction.

This leads me to a third important point. I am extremely concerned that the excessive consultation demanded by the committee will expose this reorganization to political pressures. The SBA reorganization closes and consolidates a range of offices in many districts and States. This consultation may provide an irresistible opportunity for Members to maintain offices in their districts or move them back into their States.

Finally, the report language states, "Changes in SBA's programs and responsibilities should be the primary factor in determining the need to maintain individual offices in the field structure as well as at SBA headquarters." In my view, this is an important factor, but not the only one. The needs of individual communities and the level of SBA involvement there should be equally critical in deciding which offices to maintain or close. SBA branches should be located near the people and businesses who need and use SBA services.

Mr. Chairman, I find this report language on the SBA reorganization ill-considered and politically motivated. Let's not use the SBA as a political football. I urge my colleagues to support removal of this language in conference.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice and State Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996.

Last September the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 was signed into law by President Clinton. This law pledged to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets, representing a 20-percent increase in this Nation's police force. Since its enactment, over 20,000 new police officers have already been hired. In my State of Minnesota,

some 200 new officers are on the streets protecting the citizens of my State as we speak. The COPS Program is working, and it is beyond comprehension why this committee wants to destroy a program that the people and the police of this country want and need.

This bill attempts to strip the 5 year \$30 billion crime trust fund established under the 1994 crime law and use it for general block grants. These funds, by law, were to be used for law enforcement, crime prevention, domestic violence prevention and prisons. Instead my Republican colleagues would rather put the money in block grants that have no guarantee one cent will be spent to hire more officers or fund a prevention program. In fact, this bill intends to fund a block grant program policy that has not even been considered by the Senate, much less the president, rather than an enacted law and to defund a up and running program cops on the beat that is working.

The COPS Program has put thousands of officers on the beat in our neighborhoods and communities to work with and protect the people. If my Republican friends truly believe in empowering local citizens, they should be supporting this well targeted program, not gutting it. The COPS Grant Program has been accessible, understandable and efficient since its inception. But do not take my statement alone, just ask the Fraternal Order of Police, National Association of Police Organizations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers, International Union of Police Associations, Police Executive Research Forum, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, National Troopers Coalition, Police Foundation, National Sheriffs Association, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, National Black Police Association, Major Cities Chiefs, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, all of whom support the COPS Program.

The Republican majority apparently has forgotten history in which block grants were used for exotic equipment and far flung spending, not tangible benefits. Furthermore they reduce the local match therefore placing more burden on Federal dollars and spending as opposed to the cooperative nature of the COPS Program.

I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this bill and continue on our goal of 100,000 more officers on the streets protecting the people.

Certainly the partisan antics are playing a role in this instance. The Republicans are determined to deny President Clinton his goal of achieving and fully implementing the COPS Program. The COPS Program is a good program a Clinton Program that should be maintained, let it work today and tomorrow, it is helping our communities.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. GUNDERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 198, he reported the bill back to the House with

sundry amendments adopted by the Committee on the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Meyers amendment restoring moneys to the Office of Advocacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate recorded vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 97, line 8, strike "\$217,947,000" and insert "\$222,325,000".

Page 98, line 6, strike "\$97,000,000" and insert "\$92,622,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this be a 5-minute vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 368, noes 57, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

AYES—368

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Biley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)

Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Creameans

Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Dooley
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)

Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio

Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

NOES—57

Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Barr
Barton
Burton
Chabot
Collins (GA)
Combest

DeFazio
DeLay
Doolittle
Dreier
Fields (TX)
Foley
Forbes
Gekas
Graham
Gutknecht

Reed
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Miller (FL) Roth Taylor (NC)
Molinari Royce Thomas
Moran Sanders Thornberry
Myers Sanford Visclosky
Neumann Scarborough Waldholtz
Paxon Seastrand Walker
Pombo Shadeegg Whitfield
Regula Shays Wicker
Rogers Solomon Wilson

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman Dingell Reynolds
Chenoweth Hall (OH) Rose
Collins (MI) Moakley Waxman

□ 2238

Mr. ARMEY and Mr. FOLEY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DORNAN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 272, nays 151, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

YEAS—272

Abercrombie Crane Hansen
Archer Cremeans Harman
Armey Cubin Hastert
Bachus Cunningham Hastings (WA)
Baesler Danner Hayes
Baker (CA) Davis Hayworth
Baker (LA) Deal Hefner
Ballenger DeLay Heineman
Barcia Deutsch Herger
Barr Diaz-Balart Hilleary
Barrett (NE) Dickey Hobson
Bartlett Dicks Hoekstra
Barton Dixon Hoke
Bass Doolittle Horn
Bentsen Dornan Hostettler
Bereuter Doyle Houghton
Bevill Dreier Hoyer
Bilbray Dunn Hunter
Billirakis Edwards Hutchinson
Bliley Ehlers Hyde
Blute Ehrlich Istook
Boehlert Emerson Johnson (CT)
Boehner English Johnson, Sam
Bonilla Ensign Jones
Bonior Eshoo Kaptur
Bono Everett Kasich
Boucher Ewing Kelly
Brewster Farr Kim
Browder Fawell King
Brownback Fazio Kingston
Bryant (TN) Fields (TX) Klug
Bunn Flanagan Knollenberg
Bunning Foley Kolbe
Burr Forbes LaHood
Burton Fowler Largent
Buyer Fox Latham
Callahan Franks (CT) LaTourette
Calvert Franks (NJ) Laughlin
Camp Frelinghuysen Lazio
Canady Frisa Leach
Cardin Funderburk Lewis (CA)
Castle Gallegly Lewis (KY)
Chabot Ganske Lightfoot
Chambliss Gilcrest Lincoln
Christensen Gilman Linder
Chrysler Goodlatte Lipinski
Clinger Goodling Livingston
Coble Goss LoBiondo
Coburn Green Longley
Collins (GA) Greenwood Lowey
Combest Gunderson Lucas
Condit Gutknecht Luther
Cox Hall (TX) Manzullo
Cramer Hamilton Martini

Mascara Petri Talent
McCollum Pombo Tate
McCrery Porter Tauzin
McDade Pryce Taylor (MS)
McHugh Quillen Taylor (NC)
McInnis Quinn Thomas
McIntosh Radanovich Thornberry
McKeon Ramstad Thornton
Meyers Regula Thurman
Mica Riggs Tiahrt
Miller (FL) Rivers Torkildsen
Minge Roberts Torricelli
Molinari Rogers Traficant
Mollohan Rohrabacher Upton
Montgomery Ros-Lehtinen Vento
Moorhead Roth Visclosky
Moran Roukema Vucanovich
Morella Royce Waldholtz
Murtha Sabo Walker
Myrick Salmon Walsh
Nethercutt Sawyer Wamp
Neumann Saxton Ward
Ney Schiff Watts (OK)
Norwood Schumer Weldon (FL)
Nussle Seastrand Weldon (PA)
Oberstar Shadeegg Weller
Ortiz Shaw White
Orton Shays Whitfield
Oxley Shuster Wicker
Packard Skaggs Wilson
Pallone Skeen Wise
Parker Skelton Wolf
Paxon Smith (MI) Young (AK)
Payne (VA) Smith (NJ) Young (FL)
Pelosi Smith (TX) Zeliff
Peterson (FL) Spence Zimmer
Peterson (MN) Stenholm

NAYS—151

Ackerman Gordon Owens
Allard Graham Pastor
Andrews Gutierrez Payne (NJ)
Baldacci Hancock Pickett
Barrett (WI) Hastings (FL) Pomeroy
Becerra Hefley Portman
Beilenson Hilliard Poshard
Berman Hinchey Rahall
Bishop Holden Rangel
Borski Inglis Reed
Brown (CA) Jackson-Lee Richardson
Brown (FL) Jacobs Roemer
Brown (OH) Jefferson Roybal-Allard
Bryant (TX) Johnson (SD) Rush
Chapman Johnson, E. B. Sanders
Clay Johnston Sanford
Clayton Kanjorski Scarborough
Clement Kennedy (MA) Schaefer
Clyburn Kennedy (RI) Schroeder
Coleman Kennelly Scott
Collins (IL) Kildee Sensenbrenner
Conyers Kleczka Serrano
Cooley Klink Sisisky
Costello Klink Slaughter
Coyne Lantos Solomon
Crapo Levin Souder
de la Garza Lewis (GA) Spratt
DeFazio Lofgren Stark
DeLauro Maloney Stearns
Dellums Manton Stockman
Doggett Markey Stokes
Dooley Martinez Studds
Duncan Matsui Stump
Durbin McCarthy Stupak
Engel McDermott Tanner
Evans McHale Tejeda
Fattah McKinney Thompson
Fields (LA) McNulty Torres
Filner Meehan Towns
Flake Meek Tucker
Foglietta Menendez Velazquez
Ford Metcalf Volkmer
Frank (MA) Mfume Waters
Frost Miller (CA) Watt (NC)
Furse Mineta Williams
Gejdenson Mink Wyden
Gephardt Myers Wynn
Geren Nadler Yates
Gibbons Neal
Gillmor Obey
Gonzalez Oliver

NOT VOTING—11

Bateman Gekas Rose
Chenoweth Hall (OH) Smith (WA)
Collins (MI) Moakley Waxman
Dingell Reynolds

□ 2254

Mr. SERRANO and Mr. WYDEN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as cosponsor of H.R. 359.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 85

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN] be removed as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 85.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PACKARD, YOUNG of Florida, TAYLOR of North Carolina, MILLER of Florida, WICKER, LIVINGSTON, FAZIO, THORNTON, DIXON, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1444

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 1444.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTINGS

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues this